

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CSBN 193425)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7102
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
julie.arbuckle@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR No.: CR 06-0783 JSW
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
)	<u>ORDER EXCLUDING TIME</u>
v.)	
)	
JOSE MERAS-SOTO,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On December 14, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from December 14, 2006 to February 1, 2007 in the interests of justice, for effective preparation of counsel, and for consideration of a change of plea because defense counsel required time to obtain and review additional information relevant to whether there will be a change of plea in this case. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and consideration of a change of plea, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice

served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

DATED: December 21, 2006

/s/
JULIE A. ARBUCKLE
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: December 21, 2006

/s/
GEOFFREY HANSEN
Attorney for Defendant Jose Meras-Soto

As the Court found on December 14, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from December 14, 2006 to February 1, 2007 in the interests of justice and for effective preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 3, 2007


Jeffrey S. White
United States District Judge